(Ontario's School System.)

History of Education

IN THE

PROVINCE.

Facts Clearly Stated.

The Past and the Present.

History of Education

IN THE

PROVINCE.

Facts Clearly Stated—The Past and the Present.

From 1846 till 1876 the educational interests of Ontario were administered by the late Dr. Egerton Ryerson as Chief Superintendent, acting under the advice of a Council of Public Instruction appointed by the Crown. The Chief Superintendent and his Council were invested with authority to make regulations respecting the training and licensing of teachers, the authorization of text-books, the courses of study in Public and High Schools, and all other matters of a similar character. These regulations, so long as they were within the statutory powers of the Council of Public Instruction, had the force of law. Although universally admitted that Dr. Ryerson's administration of the Education Department was characterized by great ability, it was generally felt that a Department dealing with the expenditure of large school grants and other public funds and controlling interests of such a vital character as the education of half a million of children, should be brought more directly under the control of Parliament. In this view Dr. Ryerson himself shared, and as far back as 1868 suggested in a letter to the late Sir Matthew Crooks Cameron, then Provincial Secretary, that the office of Chief Superintendent should be abolished and the Education Department placed under a responsible Minister. That Mr. Cameron looked with favor on Dr. Ryerson's proposal is evident from the correspondence which passed between them. On the 30th of

January, 1869, he wrote the Chief Superintendent, requesting him to continue in the discharge of his duties "until the Government matured a measure for placing the Education Department under the direct supervision of a member of the Executive Council."

The Liberals in Power.

On the accession of Edward Blake to office in 1871, Dr. Ryerson reiterated his desire to retire from office and renewed his recommendation that a Minister should be appointed in his place. It was not, however, until 1876 that the Government, acting upon his suggestion, amended the School Act and appointed the late Adam Crooks, then a member of the Government, to the position of Minister of Education, and at the same time brought the whole School System of the Province under the direct control of Parliament. In this position it has continued ever since.

The change from a Chief Superintendent to a Minister of Education was strongly opposed by the Conservative party for many years, on the alleged grounds that the Department would be used for political purposes, and, consequently, the educational interests of the country would be injuriously affected. This was the view held by Sir William Meredith as leader of the Opposition, and, apparently, the view maintained by Mr. Whitney, the present leader, a few years ago.

Change of Front.

Mr. Whitney has, however, apparently changed his mind with regard to the propriety of continuing a Minister of Education, as the following resolutions will show: On the 30th of April, 1891 (See page 163 of the Journals, 1891), it was moved by Mr. White, of Essex, and seconded by Mr. Clancy, "That the Bill respecting the Education Department be not now read the third time, but that it be resolved that it is expedient to place the Education Department under the control of a non-political head, and that the said Bill be referred back to the Committee of the whole House with instructions to amend the same by providing for the abolition of the office of Minister of Education after the dissolution of the present House."

Again, on the 25th day of April, 1894 (see page 148 of the Journals, 1894), it was moved by Mr. White (Essex), seconded by Mr. Hudson, "That it is essential to a non-partizan management

of the educational affairs of this Province that the Department should not be under the control of a political head, and that the office of Minister of Education should be abolished."

For these resolutions Mr. Whitney voted, and so did such of his present colleagues as were in the House at that time. But a longer experience of a Minister of Education, czar though he may be, has taught him that the office is a proper one, and that the same ministerial responsibility should attach to a Minister of the Crown who looks after the education of the people as attaches to any other great spending department in the public service. Let us congratulate Mr. Whitney on his conversion to Liberalism, even though so near the end of the century.

Advisory Board.

But while Mr. Whitney agrees to the retention of the office of a Minister of Education he proposes that he shall not act upon his responsibility as a Minister of the Crown, but that he shall be subject to the direction of an Advisory Board. This proposition suggests one of two things, either Mr. Whitney does not know of any man in the Conservative ranks whose judgment he could trust, and therefore he proposes to put him in leading strings, or he has not considered what is involved in the principle of responsible government. The theory of our Constitution is that a Minister is responsible to Parliament as representing the people, and to Parliament only. If he has an Advisory Board which he is bound to consult, he must either accept or reject its advice. If the views of the Board and the will of Parliament are in harmony, no difficulty would arise. If not in harmony, the position of a Minister would not be an enviable one. Mr. Whitney's proposition, therefore, substitutes for parliamentary control the control of an Advisory Board, or it means nothing. He practically proposes to ask the Minister of Education to do what the Scripture says no man can do, and what no other Minister is required to do, namely, to serve two masters.

Destroys Responsible Government.

But one would suppose from Mr. Whitney's references to the Minister of Education that he acts upon his own motion and without advice from anybody—that is such advice as is consistent with his responsibility to Parliament. What are the facts? Since Mr. Ross assumed office, the School Act has been revised at different times—in 1885, 1891 and 1896. In every case, so

far as recollected, a draft of the proposed amendments was sent to inspectors, High School principals, and in some cases to active trustees, with the view of getting their opinion before the Bill even was submitted to the Government for consideration. After opinions were received changes were made perhaps in the original draft, and in this form the Bill, when approved by the Government, was submitted to Parliament for its first reading. Usually four or five weeks, and sometimes a longer time, elapsed between the first reading of the Bill and its submission to a committee of the whole House. In the meantime, Public School officers of every description had an opportunity of communicating with the Education Department or with members of Parliament. There was public discussion through the press, and the responsible Minister was in a position to advise the House with regard to every clause in the amended Bill.

How Regulations are Discussed.

A similar course has been adopted with regard to the regulations, particularly if any important change was proposed. Every Public School inspector and every principal of a High School must admit that the fullest opportunity has been given him of being heard regarding every revision of the regulations. It is not asserted that with regard to minor changes there has been the same general consultation, but even with regard to these the advice of the most experienced officers of the Department and educationists is usually sought. This preserves the principle of responsible government, and it cannot be perfectly preserved in any other way.

Approval of Parliament.

But this is not the only advice sought. If Mr. Whitney will refer to Section 8 of the Education Department Act, 1896, he will see "that every regulation of the Education Department shall be laid before the Legislative Assembly, forthwith if the Assembly is in session, or within seven days of the first meeting of the Assembly after such regulation is passed, and if the House disapproves of such a regulation, or any part of it, by resolution, then the regulation, or such part, becomes inoperative." Every regulation that has been passed by the Department during Mr. Ross' term of office has been submitted to Parliament, and has, no doubt, come under Mr. Whitney's notice, and so far, not one of these regulations has been disapproved by Parliament, nor has

Mr. Whitney nor any of his colleagues challenged them, as the Statute empowers them to do, on the floor of the House. Apart, then, from the constitutional principle involved, why should Parliament be superseded by an Advisory Board, which would, probably, cost money, and would, very possibly, lead to controversies which would serve no useful end?

Mr. Whitney's Plan an Old One.

Mr. Whitney's plan for the appointment of an Advisory Board is not a new one. In 1874 a Bill was introduced into the Legislative Assembly for the appointment of such a Council, partly appointed by the Government and partly represented by the teaching profession; of this Council Dr. Ryerson, Chief Superintendent, was ex-officio a member. Its powers were very much the same as the powers of the old Council of Public Instruction, the chief feature being its representative character. The House accepted this amendment to the School Act with some reluctance. Speeches in opposition to it were made by prominent Conservatives as well as by prominent Liberals. It was, however, accepted as an experiment, and those who are familiar with the election which took place under the Bill, notably the contest between Dr. Sangster and Goldwin Smith for a seat in the Council, would not wish to see the experiment repeated. In 1876, after two years trial, a Bill was introduced into the Legislative Assembly by the late Hon. Mr. Crooks for the abolition of the Council and the appointment of a Minister of Education. It is well known that this Bill was introduced at the instance of Dr. Ryerson, than whom no man had a wider experience in the administration of the Education Department, or whose opinion had greater weight on educational matters. The abolition of the Council received more or less support on both sides of the House, Mr. Patterson, of Essex, now Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, declaring that "he was glad to find the Council of Public Instruction was to be legislated out of existence, as it was a change in the right direction from irresponsible to responsible government." The division on the second reading of the Bill was opposed by only twenty-five members in the Legislature. Now Mr. Whitney proposes to repeat an experiment which was tried under the most favorable conditions and resulted in a failure. At every general election since 1876 the electors have approved of the management of the Education Department by a Minister responsible to them through Parliament, with the right to take advice from Parliament (Mr.

Whitney included), and it is not likely that they will withdraw that confidence in the general election which we are now approaching.

Political Influence in the Education Department.

The Opposition alleges that the Education Department is used for political purposes. That can only mean that the distribution of school moneys, or the examinations conducted by the Department, or the appointments which it controls, have a political object in view. If so, there should be no difficulty in furnishing proof.

Distribution of Moneys.

All moneys voted by Parliament for school purposes are distributed on conditions defined in the School Act. Any departure from these conditions ought to be easily verified. Since the appointment of a Minister of Education, in 1876, the sum of $14,467,141 has been distributed by the Education Department. Can the Opposition show that one dollar of that sum was granted on the ground of political favoritism? If not, the charge fails. If the Department was acting from political motives, surely where so much money has been paid and where so many schools and municipalities are affected, some evidence of partizanship could be produced.

Departmental Examinations.

Since the appointment of the present Minister of Education (1884 to 1896 inclusive) 325,208 persons have written at the various examinations conducted by the Education Department, to whom certificates have been awarded as follows:

For Entrance to High Schools	112,458
For Public School Leaving Examinations	5,384
For County Model School Examinations	17,179
For Normal School Examinations	5,334
For Normal College Examinations	1,051
For Non-Professional Examinations	33,770
Total	175,176

If departmental certificates were granted or refused for political reasons the Opposition could surely find some evidence of political motive where over three hundred thousand candidates were concerned. If that evidence is not forthcoming, then this charge must fail.

Appointments by the Department.

Since 1876 the Education Department has appointed, to fill positions vacated by death or resignation or to other appointments required by the growth of the Department, 80 persons. Can it be shown that one of these was appointed for his political leanings rather than his fitness? If not, then this charge fails.

DEPARTMENTAL EXAMINATIONS.

The Opposition complains that the Education Department by its many examinations destroys the individuality of the teacher and interferes with the real education of the pupil. Of this no proof has been given, for it has not been shown that the children of to-day are not as well educated as they were under Dr. Ryerson twenty years ago. Examinations are conducted under every School System in the world, and the Opposition has not shown how the present number could be reduced. In fact, examinations are necessary:

(1) As a stimulus to the pupils.

(2) To test the efficiency of the teacher.

(3) To satisfy parents and guardians with regard to the standing of their children from time to time.

In 1875, the last year of Dr. Ryerson's administration, the following examinations were authorized by the Council of Public Instruction:

(1) Quarterly examinations for Public Schools; now the examinations are half-yearly.

(2) Half-yearly examinations to High Schools; now the examinations are yearly.

(3) Two Intermediate examinations for High Schools; now abolished.

(4) Four examinations for Temporary Teachers' Certificates all abolished.

(5) Twelve Normal School examinations for Teachers' Certificates; now reduced to two.

(6) Two examinations for County Model Schools; now reduced to one.

(7) One examination for High School Assistant Teachers.

Total examinations under Dr. Ryerson, 27.

Total examinations now conducted by the Department, 13.

And if we omit from these the examinations for Kindergarten Teachers, rendered necessary by the establishment of Kinder-

gartens since Dr. Ryerson's time, the number would be 11 as compared with 27.

Certain Examinations Unnecessary.

(1) A pupil can take the whole Public School course, from the Kindergarten to the end of the Fifth Form, without taking any Departmental Examinations whatsoever, unless the visits of the Inspector be considered an examination.

(2) A pupil may pass from the Kindergarten through the Public School and High School by simply taking one examination, viz: the Entrance to the High School, for which no fees are imposed by the Department. If fees are charged in any case it is on the authority of the Board of Trustees.

Examinations for Matriculation.

In 1883, when the present Minister of Education took charge of the Department, examinations for Matriculation into the University took place in September at a time most inconvenient to pupils and teachers, and each of the four Universities of Ontario had a separate examination, for which an entrance fee was invariably charged. Now, any person may pass his matriculation examination at the close of the school term in June, on a common standard accepted by all the Universities.

The Examination of Teachers.

In 1875 there were 17 different grades of certificates issued to teachers of Public Schools. In 1897 there are only 4 grades, viz., 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and District. In 1875 there were four grades of certificates issued to teachers of High Schools; now there are three grades. A reduction in the grades of teachers' certificates from 24 in 1875 to 7 in 1897 is not unworthy of notice.

Centralization of Control.

In 1875, the Council of Public Instruction granted 1st, 2nd, and 3rd class Provincial certificates. In 1896 the Education Department grants only 1st and 2nd class certificates. In 1896 there were issued by the Education Department 571 certificates, and by County Boards 1,549 certificates. Where is the evidence that the Education Department has been centralizing power? Since 1881 the examination papers for teachers' certificates of every grade were prepared by the Education Department, and the answer papers read by examiners appointed by the Education Department. Except, therefore, as to mere matters of detail, there has been no change in the mode of conducting the exami-

nations for teachers' certificates since 1881. Prior to the appointment of the present Minister of Education, the examination of teachers was conducted by medical students, law students, University undergraduates, clergymen and teachers, some of whom had retired from the active duties of their profession for many years. The examinations are now conducted by persons actively engaged in the profession, all of whom hold 1st-class certificates or a University Degree, and are fresh from the activities of the schoolroom.

How Examinations are Conducted in Other Provinces.

In every Province of the Dominion, the Department of Education directly controls the examination of teachers, and also the examinations from one grade of school to a higher grade of school. In a few of the Provinces the Education Department directs the Matriculation examination in the University. In the State of New York there is a standing Board of Examiners paid annual salaries ranging from $800 to $2,500, by whom the examination of teachers is conducted, and instead of one examination a year, as in Ontario, the State of New York conducts six examinations per year for teachers' certificates. In England, Scotland, Ireland, Germany and France, the Department of Education grants certificates to teachers under conditions very much the same as now prevail in the Province of Ontario. There is no greater centralization now of examinations than existed before the present Minister of Education took office, nor greater than exists in the other Provinces of the Dominion.

Appointment of Examiners.

The Opposition alleges that because High School masters are appointed examiners by the Education Department, that they are therefore made subservient to the political views of the Government. It is not true, however, that examiners are appointed either by the Minister of Education or by the Government. By an Act of the Session of 1897, an educational council of 12 persons is appointed, to whom the whole work of the examination of teachers is entrusted. Six members of the Council are appointed by the University, and six by the Minister of Education. These represent every University in the Province, as well as the High and Public Schools, and are men of the highest standing as educationists. By Act of Parliament this Council is authorized to appoint examiners for the different departmental examinations. The list from which their choice is made is submitted by the Minister of Education, and consists of such persons

as hold a Degree from some Provincial University, actively engaged in teaching. The Minister is required to submit at least twice as many names as may be required for the work of examination, and from this list the Council makes its choice, and its choice is final. When it is stated that the Minister invariably submits the name of every person qualified for appointment, the charge that the patronage of the Department is used for political purposes utterly fails. If any examiner had been appointed by the Minister, or omitted from the list of eligible appointments because of his political predilections, there would be some cause for complaint. But of this there is no proof.

Examination Fees, 1892-1896.

	Receipts.	Cost.
1892	$21,126 12	$23,032 01
1893	23,650 93	21,859 88
1894	24,168 23	24 473 11
1895	27,377 56	26,681 16
1896	34,002 58	32,935 00
	$130,325 42	$128,981 16

Balance in favor of the Department $1,344.26, or an average of only $268.85 per annum. It would be impossible to estimate in advance more accurately the receipts and expenditures.

Cost of Text Books.

Mr. Whitney and his colleagues complain of the number and cost of text books used in the Public Schools. In order that there be no doubt as to the number authorized, the full list of text books used in the Public Schools and their retail price is here given :

First Reader, Part I	$0 10
First Reader, Part II	0 15
Second Reader	0 20
Third Reader	0 30
Fourth Reader	0 40
High School Reader	0 50
Public School Arithmetic	0 25
Public School Algebra and Euclid	0 25
Public School Geography	0 75
Public School Grammar	0 25
Public School History of England and Canada	0 30
History of the Dominion of Canada, Clement (for Fifth Form)	0 50
Public School Drawing Course six numbers—each 5c	0 30
Public School Physiology and Temperance	0 25
Public School Writing Course, six numbers, (five at 7c., one at 10c.)	0 45
Total Cost	$4 95

Any pupil can complete the Public School Course without purchasing a single text book not mentioned in the above list, and with reasonable care no pupil need purchase more than one book in each subject. Usually it takes ten years to complete the Public School Course. As the cost of the complete set of text books is $4.95, the average cost per annum for text books for each pupil would not exceed 50 cents, or, to be accurate, 49½ cents.

Average Cost for the Whole Province.

The publishers of school text books furnish the Education Department when required with a statement showing the total number of text books sold during the year. Taking the average cost, during the last three years, from statements so submitted to the Department, it is found that the cost of text books to the pupils attending the Public Schools of Ontario averaged 19⅞ cents per pupil.

Cost in Toronto.

In the city of Toronto text books are purchased for the pupils by the School Board under what is known as the Free Text Book System. In reply to a request from the Minister of Education, dated Toronto, March 3rd, 1897, Mr. James L. Hughes states that "The cost of text books per pupil for 1896, on the basis of total enrolment, omitting Kindergarten pupils, was 18 cents. Omitting the supply of new books given out for the first time, the cost of text books was 5 cents per pupil."

Provincial Model Schools.

The Education Department supplies the text books used by pupils in the Provincial Model Schools free of charge. The Toronto Model School is attended by about 450 pupils. The average of the last three years shows that the cost of text books per pupil amounted to 40½ cents.

The City of Hamilton.

Mr. Ballard, the Inspector of the city of Hamilton, places the average cost of text books in Hamilton at 24 cents per pupil.

Cost of Text Books in the United States.

In the United States the publication of text books is not in any way controlled by the Department of Instruction. Publishers, therefore, fix their own prices to the consumer and the

local school authorities have power to change text books from time to time as they may deem expedient. In some States the Free Text Book System has been adopted, *i.e.*, the trustees purchase the text books for the use of pupils, charging the cost to the ratepayers in the same way as the salaries of teachers and other school expenses are charged. The following statement shows the cost per pupil in a few States and cities that have adopted free text books:

Massachusetts, average cost per pupil	$1 59
Illinois, " " "	1 25
East Saginaw (Mich.), average cost of 9 years	61
Cambridge (Mass.), average cost per pupil	1 92
Buffalo, (estimated) " " "	75
Minnesota, " " "	95
Vermont, " " "	2 11
Maine, " " "	46
Rhode Island, " " "	1 13
Toronto, " " "	18
Hamilton, " " "	24
Provincial Model School " " "	40
Ontario as a whole, " " "	19

The average of 87 cities in the United States, as reported by the State Superintendent, Washington, is 50 cents.

It needs no argument to show that on the score of economy the text book system of the Province of Ontario is far more economical than the text book system of the United States. No parent need complain of the price of text books when the actual cost is certainly less than one cent per week on an average.

Changes in Text Books.

The first series of Readers used in the Public Schools of Ontario was authorized by Dr. Ryerson in 1846.

The second series of Readers was authorized by Dr. Ryerson in 1867.

The present series of Readers was authorized in 1884.

There have been, therefore, but two changes in the Readers since our school system was organized, *i.e.*, in 50 years.

The following statement gives the dates at which the text books now in use in the Public Schools were authorized:

First Reader, Part I First Reader, Part II Second Reader Third Reader Fourth Reader	1884.

High School Reader, 1886.
Public School Arithmetic, 1887.
Public School Algebra and Euclid, 1894.
Public School Geography, 1887.
Public School Grammar, 1887.
Public School History of England and Canada, 1892.
History of the Dominion of Canada (for Fifth Form), 1897.
Public School Drawing Course, 1891.
Public School Physiology and Temperance, 1893.
Public School Writing Course, 1891, Angular; 1896, Vertical.

Authority of Trustees.

Although the Department exercises the right of changing the text books when deemed necessary, trustees are empowered to continue the use of a former text book so long as it appears on the authorized list. Sec. 90 of the Public Schools Act provides as follows: "Any authorized text book in actual use in any public or model school may be changed by the teacher of such school for any other authorized text book in the same subject, on the written approval of the trustees and the Inspector, provided always such change is made at the beginning of a school term, and at least six months after such approval has been given."

Books Added.

(a) TEMPERANCE—Representations were made to the Department by the friends of Temperance, particularly the W.C.T.U. that the study of Physiology and Temperance would be of advantage to the school children as a means of guarding them against the dangerous use of alcoholic stimulants and narcotics. Accordingly a text book was authorized in 1893. (The text book previously used was merely optional). In the United States, where this subject is taught, the course is divided into three parts, and a text book authorized for each sub-division of the course, the cost of which for the full course amounts to 80 cents. The cost of the Temperance text book used in Ontario is 25 cents.

(b) EUCLID AND ALGEBRA—In order to enable pupils in the Fifth Form to complete the course of study in Algebra and Euclid, without being obliged to purchase the text book authorized in these subjects for the High School Course, a new text book was prepared, covering the work prescribed for the Fifth Form, and called "Public School Euclid and Algebra," which sells for 25

cents. This relieves the pupils from purchasing the text books in the same subjects in the High School Course, which sell for $1.25, thus saving $1 to each pupil in the Fifth Form.

(c) WRITING COURSE—Previous to 1891 there was no authorized copybook inWriting. The copybooks in the market were sold at 10 cents each. In order to control the price, the Department authorized a series of copybooks, and fixed the price at 7 cents per copybook, saving 3 cents to each pupil in the Writing Course, or about $14,000 to the whole Province.

(d) DOMINION HISTORY—In order to promote the attachment of Canadians to their own country, it was considered advisable by the school authorities of the different Provinces that a text book should be introduced into all the schools of Canada in which the History of Canada would be presented as a Dominion and not as separate Provinces. For the preparation of this History the various Provinces contributed $2,000. After much labor a suitable history was at length prepared and accepted by the Education Departments of every Province. This History is authorized for the Fifth Form of Public Schools and for the High Schools of Ontario, and is sold for 50 cents. To this addition to the Text Books no loyal Canadian can object.

Number of Text Books Used.

In 1875, the last full year of Dr. Ryerson's administration there were used in the different subjects of the Public School Course 55 text books.

In 1883, the last year of Mr. Crooks' administration, there were used in the Public Schools of Ontario, 53 text books.

In 1898, there are now in use in the Public Schools 11 text books. In each case the Readers are counted as one text book.

The policy of the Department is to authorize but one text book in each subject, so that pupils in changing from one locality to another, or from one school to another, may not be required to purchase new books.

Great Reduction Made.

To show the extent to which the publication of text books has been simplified within the last few years, it may be stated that in 1883, before the present Minister of Education took charge, several text books in the same subject were used in the Public Schools.

In Grammar	11	different text books.
In Geography	9	" " "
In Arithmetic	4	" " "
In History	5	" " "
In Reading	3	series of text books.

In each of these subjects there is but one text book now in use.

High School Text Books.

In 1875 there were used in the High Schools of Ontario, 80 different text books; in 1883, 131; in 1898, 25. Of the 25 in use now two are common to both the Public and High School course, and with the exception of Algebra and Composition, there is but one text book in each subject.

Canada for the Canadians.

The policy of the Education Department is to encourage the production of text books in Canada, and to accomplish this as far as possible, the Canadian author has been given the preference over a foreign author.

In 1883, out of the 184 books used in the Public and High Schools, 49 were written by Canadians and 135 were written either by American or British authors.

In 1898 every book used in the Public and High Schools, with two exceptions, is the work of a Canadian author. The two exceptions are the Euclid and the Greek Beginner's Book, both used in High Schools.

Encourage Home Manufactures.

In 1883, 87 of the text books used in the Public and High Schools were imported from abroad.

In 1898, every text book used in the Public and High Schools is manufactured in Canada, thus giving employment to our own printers, binders, paper manufacturers, etc.

Reduction in Price.

	Price in 1883.	Price in 1898.	No. of Pupils in Subject, 1896.	Money saved.
Drawing Books	$ .15	$ .5	447,455	$44,745 50
Writing Books	.10	.7	464.286	13.928 58
2nd Reader	.25	.20	91,808	4,590 40
3rd "	.35	.30	99.108	4,955 40
4th "	.45	.40	89,522	4,476 10
5th "	.60	.50	19,014	1,901 40
Total saved in above				$74,597 38

List of Text Books in New York State.

A comparison between the cost of text books used in the majority of the Elementary Schools of the State of New York and the Province of Ontario may be useful:

	New York.	Ontario.
Readers	$2 57	$1 65
Arithmetic	95	25
Geography	1 80	75
Grammar	1 00	25
History	1 00	80
Drawing	1 05	30
Writing	48	45
Physiology and Temperance	1 10	25
Algebra and Euclid	Not used	25
Total cost	$9 95	$4 95

Text Books by Prison Labor.

Dr. Meacham, Member for Lennox, suggested that our text books should be made at the Central Prison, and in this way could be furnished to the children of Ontario at a greatly reduced price. The plant and machinery for the publication of text books is very expensive, and before this work could be undertaken an outlay of about $50,000 would be necessary. In California, where the State produces all the text books under its own supervision, the initial outlay for plant and material was $170,000. Apart from the initial cost, however, nobody would think of entrusting the manufacture of text books, which require skilled labor of the highest quality, to the untrained and very often degraded classes which constitute the bulk of the prisoners at the Central Prison.

Government Grants for Education

It is said by the Opposition that the High Schools have received a more generous treatment relatively from the Government than the Public Schools since the Liberal Party came into power. This is not correct, as the following statement shows:

	1871	1896
	$ c.	$ c.
Moneys distributed among Public, Poor and Separate Schools ..... (Increase 74 per cent.)	178,975 00	312,938 00
Moneys paid to High Schools ..... (Increase 43 per cent.)	69,986 00	100,000 00
Amount per Pupil.....	9 71	4 07
Moneys paid for all School Purposes..... (Increase 100 per cent.)	351,306 00	702,457 00
Cost of Civil Government, Education Department..	20,622 00	20,045 00

To be able to carry on the work of the Education Department at a lower cost for Civil Government in 1896 than in 1871, notwithstanding the growth of the Province, is no small tribute to the Liberal Party.

Growth of Education.

Notwithstanding the criticisms of the Opposition, there is no doubt as to the steady progress of education under the present Minister. Since he took charge of the Department in 1883 the following evidences of growth are worthy of notice:

	1882	1896	Increase.
Number of Public Schools.....	5,203	5,996	793
Number of Teachers.....	6,587	8,988	2,131
Number of First-Class Certificates.....	246	297	51
Number of Second-Class Certificates....	2,169	3,309	1,140
Number Trained in Normal School.....	1,873	3,418	1,545
Number of Pupils Passed Entrance Exms	4,371	10,240	5,869
Number of High Schools.....	104	130	26
Number of New High School Buildings since 1882.....	.....	45	.....
Number of High School Teachers.....	332	574	242
Number of Pupils in High Schools.....	12,348	24,567	12,219
Number of Pupils who left for Agricultural Pursuits.....	646	1,139	493
Number who left for Mercantile life....	881	1,326	444
Number of Public Libraries.....	94	368	274
Number of Volumes taken out by Readers	251,920	1,107,365	855,445
Number of Students—School of Science.	18	142	124
Number of University Students.....	342	741	399

THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

(From speeches by Hon. G. W. Ross.)

Mr. Whitney advocates the complete separation of the University from Government control, on two grounds, (1) that it be protected against the malign influence of designing politicians; and (2) that it might receive contributions to its endowments from the millionaires of the Province.

Let me answer these propositions historically. The present constitution of the University was the work of the late Robert Baldwin, and was adopted by the old Parliament of Canada in 1849, for two purposes, to remove the University from denominational control and to protect its endowments which were being wasted by irresponsible trustees.

Amendments were made to this Act in 1853, under Sir Francis Hincks, and various amendments in subsequent years; but the principle of parliamentary control was retained in every change, and, so far as I know, never questioned. Since the Baldwin Act of 1849, we have had a succession of great parliamentary leaders in power and in opposition. We had Hincks and Sir John Macdonald, and George Brown and Sandfield Macdonald, and Edward Blake and Sir Matthew Crooks Cameron, and Sir Oliver Mowat and Sir William Meredith, but it remained for Mr. Whitney, whose parliamentary experience, to say the least, is not comparable with any of the persons named, to propose the complete separation of the University from the control of the Executive Government. You can judge for yourselves whether his political experience warrants him in setting aside the policy of his predecessors, and completely changing the relations of the University to the State by which it was founded.

1. Let us examine somewhat in detail what the proposed separation means. By report of a Committee of the Board of Trustees submitted to the House in 1894, the value of the University endowments, including buildings, investments, real estate and equipment, was estimated at $3,856,873.99, or in round numbers, $4,000,000. This endowment is the product of lands appropriated to the use of the University by the advice of Governor Simcoe, in 1797, or one hundred years ago. Mr. Whitney proposes that this valuable estate, which is the gift of the people of Ontario, shall be removed from the control of Parliament, which represents the people, and handed over to somebody, he does not

say to whom, but to somebody beyond the reach of political control. He might as well say that the Parliament Buildings and all our public institutions should be transferred in a similar way, and if the public buildings, why not the Crown Lands? Are you prepared for this? Why should Parliament abrogate its functions with regard to such an important trust? Let Mr. Whitney answer!

2. The surrender of Parliamentary control over the University means that its course of studies shall be regulated by some board, he does not say how appointed, removed from political control. Mr. Whitney forgets, however, that its courses of study are now regulated by the Senate, on which the Government is represented by only nine members out of a total of sixty-one, and that, so far as I know, no recommendation of the Senate for the last twenty years has been disapproved by the Government; but as the course for matriculation to a certain extent determines the course of study in our High Schools and Collegiate Institutes, would it be prudent to imperil the organization of our magnificent system of higher education by placing its courses of study in the hands of an irresponsible body, no matter how wise or how learned it may be. If the unity of our system is to be preserved, the articulation of all its parts must be regulated by some central authority and under responsible government, that authority is the government of the day. It took more than fifty years of labor and legislation to bring the School System of Ontario to the position in which it commands the admiration of all who understand it, and of all who have studied its characteristics. Mr. Whitney inaugurates his leadership by striking a blow—what I would consider a fatal blow—at the higher education of the Province—a blow that would affect every Public and High School in the Province.

3. When Mr. Whitney proposes to remove the University from the control of Parliament, has he considered the effect upon other educational bodies? The University has from time to time affiliated a number of colleges and schools, all of which are interested in its success, and entitled also to be heard before such a drastic change is made in its organization. I need only mention a few. First in point of intimacy of relation stands Victoria University. It will be remembered that in 1887, with the approval of the Methodist Conference of Canada, and after prolonged discussion, it was agreed that Victoria University should be removed from Cobourg and federated with the University of Toronto. As a guarantee of good faith, it was provided that the

University of Victoria should be represented on the Senate of Toronto University by its Chancellor, one person appointed by the authorities of Victoria University, the Principal of Albert College, and five persons elected by the graduates, or eight in all. Supposing a majority of the Senate so far forgot itself as to legislate adversely to the interests of Victoria University, and supposing there was no appeal from the Senate to the Government of the day, in what position would Victoria University find itself with eight representatives in a Senate of sixty-one members? Victoria University is splendidly equipped. By its federation with the University of Toronto its students have the same privileges as the undergraduates of Toronto with respect to the instruction given in every department of the University Course. Mr. Whitney would imperil all these privileges, and would imperil the relations between Victoria and the University of Toronto, by his proposed scheme of separation from Government control. I tell him now, and I am fully impressed with the responsibility of the statement, that the federation of Victoria University would not be worth an hour's purchase if Mr. Whitney's views prevail after the next election.

Less intimately, but of equal importance to the parties concerned, are the affiliation of Knox College and St. Michael's College. Ever since the establishment of Knox College, its undergraduates have availed themselves of the instruction given in Toronto University, and since its federation in 1885, the privileges which it enjoys are guarded partly by Act of Parliament and partly by the Senate. The same may be said of St. Michael's, the only Catholic College in Canada similarly situated. Does Mr. Whitney propose to say to the constituencies which these two Colleges represent, that they are no longer to look to Parliament for protection, but that their interests are to be handed over to an irresponsible body over which Parliament is to exercise no direct control? Then we have the interests of the Medical Colleges, of the Druggists, of the Dentists, of the Engineers, of the Agricultural College and the Veterinary College, or in all of thirteen federated and affiliated institutions to be disposed of as if it were a mere matter of routine. All the institutions of higher education in their relation to Arts, Theology and Medicine, and all other professions, minor and major, that cluster around the University, and have gravitated towards it, representing last year 1,393 students, are to be turned adrift without the guiding and regulating hand of that Parliament by which they were brought into existence, and under which

they have achieved signal success. This would be a triumph of irresponsible government, more in harmony with the practices of the Family Compact than any form of legislation with which I have had any experience in 25 years. For such a proposition Mr. Whitney has no precedent in the organization of any State University in the world, nor can he quote in its support the name of a single leader in his own party or in the Liberal party, from the days of Baldwin, to the day of his first speech in the present campaign. Let me enquire of him if there has been a single petition presented to Parliament for such a change? Has the Senate of the University asked for it? Has Victoria College or Knox College, or St. Michael's College, or any one of the affiliated colleges asked for it? Have the graduates asked for it? Some of them have seats in Parliament. Do they ask for this change? Is this a part of his general policy, that whatever is must be changed? Are the old landmarks to be removed and the institutions which our fathers founded to be overturned because a new leader has arisen—a leader who has no claims upon our confidence because of his connection with University work of any kind whatever.

4. "But," says Mr. Whitney, "we want the University to prosper. It is a great institution, but it needs more money. Nobody will help it so long as it is a State institution. Remove it from State control and rich men will be tumbling over each other, so eager will they be to add to its endowments. Look at McGill, and so on." Now, this is a pretty picture, but it is "the stuff that dreams are made of," and they are not reducible to substantial bank balances. I admit McGill has been generously endowed. All honor to the men to whom it owes its prosperity. But we have in Canada 16 universities, only two of them—the University of Toronto and Manitoba—in any positive sense under State control. How many of them have fared like McGill? Laval University, which is an outgrowth of the Seminary of Quebec, founded in 1663, has still to depend upon the endowments it received from Louis XIV. and the early bishops of the Roman Catholic church over 200 years ago. The Universities of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, four in number, and some of them over one hundred years old, will scarcely average $100,000 each in endowments, although they are more independent in their organization than McGill. And when we come to Ontario, we find that Queen's and Victoria, both older than Toronto, and both independent of the State, cannot boast of an endowment of a full half-million apiece. What has dried up the fountains of private

beneficence in their case? They are as well organized as McGill, and I have no doubt are as useful and efficient. Would it not be the honest and proper thing for Mr. Whitney, before flying his university kite, to look over the whole field of university education and endowment, to see if there was any ground for his expectation that the change which he proposes would bring to the University any additional revenue? Or, perhaps, Mr. Whitney knows of certain millionaires who are waiting to give their money if his policy is adopted. If so, he should say so, that we might hold our caps for this shower of gold which is about to fall.

5. But is McGill University, whose golden harvests have aroused such envy, really more independent of Government control than Toronto? Let us compare its Charter with the Act of Parliament governing Toronto University—and first as to their respective powers to manage their own internal affairs. As already stated, the Senate of Toronto University has power to pass statutes prescribing courses of study for Matriculation and for every Degree in Arts, Medicine or any other branch of learning which the Senate thinks proper, subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council; such statute has no effect till so approved. In the case of McGill, every Statute, Rule or Ordinance of the Governors of the University is subject to the disapproval of the Governor-General of Canada, and is not operative for 60 days after it is passed; if within such time it is not disapproved by the Governor-General, then it becomes binding, subject, however, to be revised or set aside by Her Majesty's Privy Council. Is this the independence Mr. Whitney says has given McGill such large endowments?

The Governor-General has similar power with respect to the appointment of Professors to the University, that is, he may disapprove of any of them within 60 days, otherwise it takes effect. In Toronto, the appointments are made by Order-in-Council; in McGill, by the Governors or Trustees of the University. A partizan government may make political appointments to the University of Toronto, it is true, and a partizan Governor-General may refuse to approve of appointments to McGill that were not partizan. Where is the substantial difference? The main difference between the so-called independence of McGill and the subordinate position which Toronto occupies, is that all the Statutes and Ordinances of McGill go into effect when passed by the University authorities, if not disapproved within 60 days by the Governor-General; in the case of the University of Toronto,

they have no effect until approved; and, in the second place, the Professors of McGill University are appointed by the Governors or Trustees, subject to disallowance by the Governor-General within 60 days; in Toronto, they are appointed directly by the Government under an Order-in-Council.

Now, is it reasonable to suppose this fine distinction as to the so-called independence of McGill has moved the wealthy and public-spirited citizens of Montreal to bestow upon it such large sums of money? Is there not more wealth in Montreal to start with than there is in Toronto? Then McGill is the only Protestant, undenominational University in Quebec, having to compete with the Roman Catholic University so well endowed two centuries ago Had that circumstance no effect in moving moneyed men to help it on? Absolute independence it does not possess, certainly not to the same extent as Victoria or Queen's—why the difference in the gifts which each has received? Would it not be proper and fair for Mr. Whitney to weigh all these circumstances before jumping to the conclusion that the State which brought the University of Toronto into existence should disown its own offspring or hand it over to the tender mercies of imaginary millionaires whose charity has so far been a negative quantity?

6. Still another view of the question. Does Mr. Whitney know that there is provision for the endowment of Chairs and Scholarships in the University of Toronto, now so that donors may direct the application of any gift without the interference of the State, once the gift or endowment has been accepted by the Crown on behalf of the University? For proof I would refer him to Sections 82 to 85 of the Federation Act, 1887. As a matter of fact, the University is now in possession of 29 Scholarships, ranging in annual value from $105 to $230, from friends of the University, not one of which is controlled by the Government. The aggregate value of these Scholarships is $77,000, and all of them are applied as directed by the donors, and cannot, without the consent of the donors or their representatives, be diverted to any other purpose. A similar privilege is allowed by the Act with respect to Chairs in any faculty of the University. In the dispute which arose between the University and the City of Toronto, with respect to the occupation of the Queen's Park, with which I had to deal as Minister of Education, the claims of the University were settled by accepting from the City, in lieu of the forfeiture of its lease of the Park, the endowment of two Chairs, one in English Literature and the other in

Geology and Mineralogy, to be maintained by the city for 999 years. In some Universities, not only is the purpose to which such gifts is to he applied prescribed by the donors, but the mode of appointing Professors to the Chair so to be established is also prescribed, and there would be nothing to hinder the application of such a rule to any gift bestowed upon the University of Toronto. The University has also received $61,000 for the restoration of its Library after the disastrous fire of 1890, every dollar of which has been applied as directed by the donors. It also occupies a hall for religious purposes, the gift of the Young Men's Christian Association. Its gymnasium and hall for the meetings of literary clubs were partially paid for by the graduates, and in the use of them there is no Government interference. In fact, the management of the University is almost as fully under the control of the Senate and Faculty now as if it were completely severed from the State.

7. But if the University of Toronto has not received large gifts from men of wealth, it is at all events free from the tyranny which in a few instances men of wealth have attempted to exercise over the teachings of the University which they have endowed, or which it was hoped they would endow. For instance, in 1895 Prof. Beemis was removed from the University of Chicago because he spoke too plainly respecting trade combines and monopolies to suit Mr. Rockefeller, who had endowed the University with nearly $12,000,000 of the money which he had made as the President of the Standard Oil Company, the largest monopoly in the world. The *Literary Digest* of October 19th, 1895, gives full details of this case, with comments of leading American papers. Prof. Beemis, in explanation of his resignation said :

"The benumbing influence of a certain class of actual or hoped-for endowments, whether this influence is directly exerted by donors or only indirectly felt by University authorities, is a grave danger now confronting some of the best institutions.

"A wealthy and leading trustee of the University spoke to me in 1893 of 'our side' in some club discussion of a noted strike. 'By our side you mean ——?' I asked. 'Why, the capitalist's side, of course,' was the quick reply.

"To a gentleman of unquestioned veracity, the President of the University (Dr. Harper), when referring to me, said in substance: 'It's all very well to sympathize with the working men, but we get our money from those on the other side, and we can't afford to offend them.'"

A few weeks ago Prof. Andrews, President of Brown Univer-

sity, was called upon to defend himself because his views on the Silver Question were not agreeable to the Board of Trustees, even although these views were advanced in an academical sense rather than with any political motives. Of course such open interference with the independence of the teaching faculty is rare. It is possible, however, that where not apparent, more than one Professor has in his mind the sources from which the revenue of his University comes, in dealing with economic or political problems.

8. If we have no evidence that the University could gain financially by the proposed change, have we any evidence that it would gain academically? Is it less prosperous relatively than any of the other 16 Universities of Canada, or of any of the Universities of the United States similarly situated? Let the attendance of students from year to year be my answer. In 1854 the attendance of students was 84, in 1896, 957, and if we add the attendance in affiliated colleges, the number would be 2883. Does that show any sign of decay? Can Mr. Whitney show such expansion on the part of any other University in Canada or the United States privately endowed?

In 1871, the number of Professors and Instructors was 15; in 1896, 46. How many students have been driven away from the University by this political Nemesis, which exists only in his imagination? How many Professors resigned because the political control was irksome? Then see the expansion in buildings in the last few years. On the Department of Biology, $150,000 have been expended; on Chemistry, $80,000; on the Library, $60,000, gymnasium, $36,000; and yet one would think, from the jeremiads of the hon. gentleman, that the grass was growing on its threshold, and that its halls were as dull and silent as a charnel house.

9. Then, has the efficiency of its instruction suffered? Go where you will, to the Universities of the Dominion or the United States, and you will find the graduates of Toronto taking prizes and Honours and Scholarships in face of the competition from Harvard and Yale, and Chicago and Cornell, notwithstanding their political independence. During the present year five graduates have been appointed to Professorships or Lectureships in the neighboring Republic. If political control were such a nightmare, how could we have such results? If Professors are political appointees as is suggested, they have shown wonderful fitness for their work, for their students excel the best men from universities that have no political relation with the State.

Take the following list of thirty graduates of the University of Toronto, recently appointed to positions in the United States, as a token of its educational power:

NAME.	RANK.	SUBJECT.	INSTITUTION.	ADDRESS.
Saunders, S. J.	Professor	Mathematics	Hamilton College	Clinton, N.Y.
Fairclough, H.R.	"	Classical Lit.	Leland-Stanford Univ	Palo Alto, Cal.
Davidson, F. J. A.	Assoc. Prof.	Romance Lang's.	" " "	" " "
Lawson, A. C.	"	Min. & Geol.	University of California	Berkeley, Cal.
Aikins, H. A	Assistant	Philosophy	Western Reserve Univ.	Cleveland, O.
McLean, J. A.	Professor	Political Science	University of Colorado	Boulder, Col.
Fraser, G. A. H.	"	Classics	Colorado College	Col. Spgs., Col.
Mustard, W. P.	"	"	Haverford College	Haverford, Pa.
Barker, L. F.	Assoc. Prof.	Anatomy	Johns Hopkins Univ.	Baltimore, Md.
Cullen, T. S	Instructor	Gynæcology	" " "	" "
Futcher, T. B	"	Medicine	" " "	" "
Logie, T	Professor		Williams College	Williamston, Mass.
Chamberlain, A. F.		Ethnology	Clark University	Worcester, Mass.
Metzler, W. H	Professor	Mathematics	Syracuse University	Syracuse, N.Y.
Metzler, G. F.	"	"	Mariette College	Mariette, O.
Frisby, E.	"	Astronomy	Meteorological Bureau	Washington, D.C.
Hall, T. P	"	Chemistry	Tabor College	Tabor, Ia.
McMurrich, J. P.	"	Anatomy	University of Michigan	Ann Arbor.
Lillie, T. R.	Instructor	Zoology	" " "	" "
Stratton, A. W.	Assistant	Sanskrit	University of Chicago	Chicago.
McLennan, S. F.	"	Philosophy	" " "	"
Laing, G.	Trav. Fellow.	Classics	Am. Assoc. Archæology	
Langley, E. F	Asst. Prof.	French	Dartmouth College	Dartmouth, N.H.
Ling, G. H.	Assistant	Mathematics	Wesleyan University	Middleton, Conn.
Shaw, W. J.	"	Psychology	Brown University	
Schofield, W. H	Trav. Fellow.	Mod. Lang's	Harvard University	
Hull, G. F	Professor	Physics	Colby University	
Kerswell, W. D.	"	Hebrew	Lincoln University	Lincoln, Pa.
Gillespie, W.	Assistant	Mathematics	Princeton University	Princeton, N.J.
Sykes, W. H	Lecturer	Univ. Extension		Pennsylvania.

10. Mr. Whitney says, "That the Minister of Education will not allow the University to be withdrawn from Government control because he wants to use it for party purposes." At Owen Sound he said, "The University of Toronto was used from January to December as an annex to the Education Department for the advancement of Mr. Ross' political schemes." Now, what proof has Mr. Whitney given of this charge? In what way has Mr. Ross used the University for political purposes? A charge so grave should be sustained by some statement of fact from a party leader. Mr. Whitney must know the truth whereof he speaks, or he should not make the charge and repeat it with painful and pitiful iteration wherever he speaks. As a lawyer he must know that in the pettiest Court in the land the plaintiff is expected to prove his case. Here he is before the highest Court—the Court of public opinion—and makes a bold, or to use his own words, a bald charge, without submitting a tittle of proof. Now, what control has the Minister of Education over the University, and how has it been exercised?

1. The Government appoints nine members to the Senate once in three years. The last appointees were Justice Boyd, Justice McLennan, Dr. Dewart, Geo. Gooderham, Esq., Dr. Hoskin, Q.C., J. T. Wood, M.P., B. E. Walker, Manager Bank of Commerce, John Sreath, Inspector of High Schools, and Rev. Father Ryan. Can Mr. Whitney find any politics in this list? If so, let him give us particulars.

2. The Minister of Education has to report to his colleagues upon any statute passed by the Senate, and recommend it for approval or disapproval. Can Mr. Whitney mention a single statute of which the Minister has disapproved in the last 14 years? I cannot think of one. Then where is the political virus of which Mr. Whitney speaks?

3. The Minister might possibly try to dominate the teaching of the University, as it is alleged has been done by Mr. Rockefeller and his allies in Chicago. If so, let us have the proof; or,

4. He might make appointments to the teaching staff of the University depend upon the political views of the candidates. If this is the charge, why not make it boldly and "baldly," and let it be investigated. I have nothing to fear. I would invite such enquiry. If true, it could surely be sustained, as out of a staff of 46 professors or lecturers in Arts, 37 have been appointed during my administration, and out of a staff of 41 in the Medical Faculty, all were appointed during my term of office. Besides, I have appointed, with the approval of my colleagues, a Librarian and several assistants, a Registrar, a Beadle and several minor officers, in all probably 100 persons, nearly all of whom are in the service still and worthy of public confidence. Let Mr. Whitney name a single political nominee on the whole list, and furnish proof that even a Division Court would accept, and I will exchange places with him in the House the very next minute. He must furnish proof or stand condemned before the public as trifling with his reputation as a leader of a great political party.